

The structures of Hausdorff metric in non-Archimedean spaces

Derong Qiu *

(School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University,
Beijing 100048, P.R.China)

Abstract As a counterpart to some extent of the Levy-Prohorov metric in the probability measure spaces, in this paper, we introduce and construct several ball-type metric structures $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}$ on mappings over spaces of balls in non-Archimedean spaces. We obtain some basic facts on them. These metrics behave very differently comparing with the usual Levy-Prohorov metric, and they are interesting in themselves. The Dudley type metric in the space of non-Archimedean measures as well as several related Hausdorff metric structures in non-Archimedean spaces are also established and studied.

Keywords: Metric space, Non-Archimedean space, probability measure, Hausdorff distance, Levy-Prohorov metric, Dudley metric, non-Archimedean distribution and measure.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 51F99, 51K05 (primary), 11F85, 14G20 (Secondary).

* E-mail: derong@mail.cnu.edu.cn, derongqiu@gmail.com

1. Introduction

As a counterpart to some extent of the Levy-Prohorov metric in the probability measure space (see [Du, p.394] and [Ra]), in this paper, we introduce and construct several ball-type metric structures (see $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}$ in the Def.4.1 below) on mappings over spaces of balls in non-Archimedean spaces. We obtain some basic facts on them (see Theorems 4.2, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.11 below). These metrics behave very differently comparing with the usual Levy-Prohorov metric, and they are interesting in themselves. The Dudley type metric in the space of non-Archimedean measures (see Theorems 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 below) as well as several related Hausdorff metric structures in non-Archimedean spaces are also established and studied (see Theorems 3.2, 3.5, 2.8, 2.10 below). This work is a continuation of [Q].

Since a p -adic distribution can be viewed as a function on the set of balls in certain ultrametric space, one of our motivation for such constructions, as implied in section 5 below, is try to find a natural metric structure for a family of p -adic L -functions, such that we can observe some phenomenon when they are convergent and have a limit, and hope to know what will happen for arithmetic information (e.g., special values) conveyed in such a limit process. This will be studied in a separated paper.

Notation and terminology. Let X be a metric space endowed with the metric d . For any subsets A and B of X , the diameter of A is $\text{diam}(A) = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in A\}$, the distance between A and B is $\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\}$, in particular, for $x \in X$, $\text{dist}(x, A) = \text{dist}(\{x\}, A)$. For a set $Y \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, its ε -neighborhood is the set $U_\varepsilon(Y) = \{x \in X : \text{dist}(x, Y) < \varepsilon\}$. The Hausdorff

distance between A and B , denoted by $d_H(A, B)$, is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(A, B) &= \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subset U_\varepsilon(B) \text{ and } B \subset U_\varepsilon(A)\} \\ &= \max\left\{\sup_{a \in A} \text{dist}(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} \text{dist}(b, A)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $a \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$ (the real number field), the *open* ball of radius r with center a is the set $B_a(r) = \{x \in X : d(a, x) < r\}$; The *closed* ball of radius r with center a is the set $\overline{B}_a(r) = \{x \in X : d(a, x) \leq r\}$. A ball in (X, d) is a set of the form $B_a(r)$ or $\overline{B}_a(r)$ for some $a \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$. In this paper, a metric may take the value ∞ . For more basic facts of metric spaces, we refer to [BBI] and [G].

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, we use the notation $\widehat{d}$ denote the non-Archimedean metric on a space X , that is, $\widehat{d}$ is a metric on X and satisfies the strong triangle inequality $\widehat{d}(x, z) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}(x, y), \widehat{d}(y, z)\}$ ($x, y, z \in X$). A set X endowed with a non-Archimedean metric $\widehat{d}_X$ is called a non-Archimedean metric space (also called ultrametric space), which is denoted by $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$. The Hausdorff distance between subsets of X is then denoted by $\widehat{d}_{X,H}$. It is well known that, in $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$, each ball is both open and closed, each point of a ball may serve as a center, and a ball may have infinitely many radii (see [Sc, p.48]). For more basic properties of non-Archimedean metric spaces, we refer to [BGR] and [Sc].

As usual, the symbols $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{F}_p, \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\mathbb{Q}_p$ represent the integers, rational numbers, real numbers, complex numbers, field with p elements, p -adic integers and p -adic numbers, respectively. We denote the completion of the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ by $\mathbb{C}_p$, which is endowed the non-Archimedean metric $\widehat{d}_p$ induced by the normalized valuation $|\cdot|_p$ satisfying $|p|_p = \frac{1}{p}$ (i.e., $\widehat{d}_p(\alpha, \beta) = |\alpha - \beta|_p, \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}_p$),

and called the Tate field (see [K], [Se]).

2. Ultrametric structures on balls

Firstly we have the following simple formula for computing the Hausdorff distance between balls in a non-Archimedean metric space.

Lemma 2.1. Let B_1 and B_2 be two balls in a non-Archimedean metric space $(X, \widehat{d})$, then their Hausdorff distance is

$$\widehat{d}_H(B_1, B_2) = \begin{cases} \text{dist}(B_1, B_2) & \text{if } B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset; \\ \max\{\text{diam}(B_1), \text{diam}(B_2)\} & \text{if } B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B_1 \neq B_2; \\ 0 & \text{if } B_1 = B_2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\widehat{d}_H(B_1, B_2) \geq \max\{\text{diam}(B_1), \text{diam}(B_2)\}$ if $B_1 \neq B_2$.

Moreover, for any non-empty subsets A_i of B_i ($i = 1, 2$), if $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$, then

$$\widehat{d}_H(A_1, A_2) = \widehat{d}_H(B_1, B_2).$$

Proof. Easily follows from the definition.

Proposition 2.2. Let (X, d) be a metric space. Then the metric d is non-Archimedean if and only if the Hausdorff distance d_H satisfies the following condition: For any balls B_1 and B_2 in X with $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$, we have $d_H(B_1, B_2) = \text{dist}(B_1, B_2)$.

Proof. The necessity follows from the above Lemma 2.1. For the sufficiency, we only need to verify that, under the given condition, the metric d satisfies the strong triangle inequality. To see this, let $a, b, c \in X$. If $d(a, b) > d(a, c)$, then we want to show that $d(a, b) = d(c, b)$. In fact, one can take a real number r with $d(a, c) < r < d(a, b)$. Then for the *closed* ball $\overline{B} = \overline{B}_a(r)$, we have $c \in \overline{B}$ and $b \notin \overline{B}$. Take an *open* ball $B_1 = B_b(r_1)$ of radius $r_1 > 0$ with center b in X such that $B_1 \cap \overline{B} = \emptyset$. By the given condition, we have $d_H(B_1, \overline{B}) = \text{dist}(B_1, \overline{B})$, then

it follows that $\text{dist}(\bar{b}_1, B_1) = \text{dist}(\bar{b}_2, B_1)$ for any $\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2 \in \bar{B}$. In particular, we have $\text{dist}(a, B_1) = \text{dist}(c, B_1)$. Then by taking the limit $r_1 \rightarrow 0$, we get $d(a, b) = d(c, b)$. So we are done, and the other cases are obvious. The proof of Proposition 2.2 is completed. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space and $A \subset X$ be a non-empty subset.

(1) For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $U_\varepsilon(U_\varepsilon(A)) = U_\varepsilon(A)$. In particular, if $A = B$ is a ball with diameter $r = \text{diam}(B)$, then $U_\varepsilon(B) = \begin{cases} B & \text{if } \varepsilon \leq r, \\ B_b(\varepsilon) & \text{if } \varepsilon > r. \end{cases}$ Here $b \in B$ can be arbitrarily chosen. Furthermore, for any positive numbers ε_1 and ε_2 , we have $U_{\varepsilon_2}(U_{\varepsilon_1}(B)) = U_{\max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}}(B)$.

(2) Let $\varepsilon > 0$, if $U_\varepsilon(A) \neq X$, then the characteristic function

$$\chi_{U_\varepsilon(A)}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in U_\varepsilon(A), \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin U_\varepsilon(A) \end{cases}$$

is uniformly continuous, and $\text{dist}(U_\varepsilon(A), X \setminus U_\varepsilon(A)) \geq \varepsilon$.

Proof. (1) follows easily from the definitions.

(2) By (1), we know that $U_\varepsilon(A)$ is uniformly open, so $\chi_{U_\varepsilon(A)}$ is uniformly continuous (see [Sc, p.50]). The last inequality follows easily from the definition. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space. Then

- (1) $\widehat{d}_H$ is a non-Archimedean semi-metric on $2^X \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ (the set of all subsets of X except the empty set $\emptyset$).
- (2) $\widehat{d}_H(A, \overline{A}) = 0$ for any $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$, where $\overline{A}$ denote the closure of A in X .
- (3) If A and B are closed subsets of X and $\widehat{d}_H(A, B) = 0$, then $A = B$.

Proof. By Proposition 7.3.3 of [BBI, p.252], we only need to verify the

strong triangle inequality for $\widehat{d}_H$. To see this, take $A, B, C \in 2^X \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, we want to show that $\widehat{d}_H(A, B) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_H(A, C), \widehat{d}_H(C, B)\}$. we may as well assume that $\widehat{d}_H(A, C) \leq \widehat{d}_H(C, B) = r$. If $r = \infty$, then we are done. So we assume that $r < \infty$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, by definition and Lemma 2.3(1), it is easy to see that

$$A \subset U_{r+\varepsilon}(C) \subset U_{r+\varepsilon}(U_{r+\varepsilon}(B)) = U_{r+\varepsilon}(B),$$

$$B \subset U_{r+\varepsilon}(C) \subset U_{r+\varepsilon}(U_{r+\varepsilon}(A)) = U_{r+\varepsilon}(A).$$

So $\widehat{d}_H(A, B) \leq r + \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. This shows that

$$\widehat{d}_H(A, B) \leq r = \max\{\widehat{d}_H(A, C), \widehat{d}_H(C, B)\}. \quad \square$$

It follows easily by Lemma 2.4 that $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is a non-Archimedean metric space, where $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is the set of non-empty closed subsets of X . Moreover, every element of the quotient $(2^X \setminus \{\emptyset\})/\widehat{d}_H$ can be represented by a closed set and therefore $(2^X \setminus \{\emptyset\})/\widehat{d}_H$ is naturally identified with $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widehat{d}_H)$. Furthermore, if X is complete (resp. compact), then $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is complete (resp. compact) (see [BBI, Prop.7.3.7 and Thm. 7.3.8]).

Recall that a ball in $(X, \widehat{d})$ is a set of the form $B_a(r)$ or $\overline{B}_a(r)$ for some $a \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$, and every ball in a non-Archimedean metric space is both open and closed.

Definition 2.5. Given a non-Archimedean metric space $(X, \widehat{d})$, we set

$$\mathcal{M}_b(X) = \{\text{all balls in } X\}, \quad \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X) = \mathcal{M}_b(X) \cup \{\{x\} : x \in X\}.$$

Since each ball in X is both open and closed, it is obvious that $\mathcal{M}_b(X), \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X) \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$. So both $(\mathcal{M}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ and $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ are subspaces of $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widehat{d}_H)$, and they are all non-Archimedean metric spaces.

Lemma 2.6. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space. If $\{B_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset$

$(\mathcal{M}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is a Cauchy sequence of balls, then either $\text{diam}(B_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, or $B_m = B_{m+i}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) for sufficiently large m .

Proof. If the conclusion that $\text{diam}(B_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ does not hold, then there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $N > 0$, there exists an integer $n > N$ satisfying $\text{diam}(B_n) \geq \varepsilon_0$. Put $\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$. Since $\{B_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence, there exists a positive integer m_0 such that for any positive integers $m, n \geq m_0$, we have $\widehat{d}_H(B_m, B_n) < \varepsilon$. Take an integer $n_0 > m_0$ such that $\text{diam}(B_{n_0}) \geq \varepsilon_0$, then for any positive integer i , we must have $B_{n_0} = B_{n_0+i}$. Otherwise, by Lemma 2.1, one has $\varepsilon_0 \leq \max\{\text{diam}(B_{n_0}), \text{diam}(B_{n_0+i})\} \leq \widehat{d}_H(B_{n_0}, B_{n_0+i}) < \varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$, a contradiction! So we obtain that $B_{n_0} = B_{n_0+i}$ for all positive integers i . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.6. $\square$

If the sequence $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of subsets of $(X, \widehat{d})$ is convergent to a subset A under $\widehat{d}_H$, we will write it as $\widehat{d}_H - \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i = A$.

Proposition 2.7. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space and $\{B_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset (\mathcal{M}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ be a sequence of balls. If $\widehat{d}_H - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} B_m = D$ for a non-empty closed subset D of X , then $D \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$.

Proof. Since $\{B_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence, by Lemma 2.6 above, $B_m = B_{m+i}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) for sufficiently large m , or $\text{diam}(B_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. For the former, we have $D = B_m \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$. So we only need to verify that D is a one-point set if $\text{diam}(B_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, if otherwise, then $\#D > 1$ and so there exist elements $a, b \in D$ with $a \neq b$. Denote $r = \widehat{d}(a, b)$, then $r > 0$. Take $\varepsilon = \frac{r}{2}$, then there exists a positive integer m_0 such that for any positive integer $m > m_0$ we have both $\text{diam}(B_m) < \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_H(B_m, D) < \varepsilon$. Thus by definition we

get $\text{dist}(a, B_m) \leq \widehat{d}_H(B_m, D) < \varepsilon$ and $\text{dist}(b, B_m) \leq \widehat{d}_H(B_m, D) < \varepsilon$. Then for any $c \in B_m$, since $\begin{cases} \widehat{d}(a, c) = \text{dist}(a, B_m) \text{ if } a \notin B_m; \\ \widehat{d}(a, c) \leq \text{diam}(B_m) \text{ if } a \in B_m, \end{cases}$ we get $\widehat{d}(a, c) < \varepsilon$. Likewise, $\widehat{d}(b, c) < \varepsilon$. Hence by the strong triangle inequality, we get $\widehat{d}(a, b) < \varepsilon$. This is impossible because $\widehat{d}(a, b) = r = 2\varepsilon$. Therefore $\sharp D = 1$ and so we are done. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.7. $\square$

Theorem 2.8. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space.

- (1) If $(X, \widehat{d})$ is complete, then $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is complete, and $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ is dense in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$, i.e., $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$.
- (2) If $(X, \widehat{d})$ is compact, then $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is compact.

Proof. (1) To show $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$ is complete, we need to verify that every Cauchy sequence in it has a limit. So we take a Cauchy sequence $\{C_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$. Then it has a limit C in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ because $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is complete by our assumption. We need to show that $C \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. To see this, firstly we assume that there exists a positive integer n_0 such that $C_n \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ for all positive integers $n > n_0$, then by Proposition 2.7 we get $C \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. Next we assume that there exists a subsequence $\{C_{n_i}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of $\{C_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $C_{n_i} = \{x_i\}$ with $x_i \in X$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Obviously, $\{C_{n_i}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is convergent and $\widehat{d}_H - \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} C_{n_i} = C$. As one can easily see that $\widehat{d}_H(\{x_i\}, \{x_j\}) = \widehat{d}(x_i, x_j)$, it follows that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(X, \widehat{d})$, and so $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i = x$ for some $x \in X$. Hence $\widehat{d}_H(\{x_i\}, \{x\}) = \widehat{d}(x_i, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. So $\widehat{d}_H - \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} C_{n_i} = \{x\}$, therefore $C = \{x\} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. This shows that $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is complete. In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$ is a closed subset in $\mathcal{M}(X)$. Now we come to show the density of $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. We may as well assume that $\mathcal{M}_b(X) \neq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. Let $C \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X) \setminus \mathcal{M}_b(X)$. Then $C = \{x\}$ for some $x \in X$.

For every positive integer n , let $C_n = B_x(\frac{1}{n})$ be the *open* ball of radius $\frac{1}{n}$ with center x as defined before. Then $C_n \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ for all $n \geq 1$. By Lemma 2.1, we have $\widehat{d}_H(C, C_n) = \widehat{d}_H(\{x\}, C_n) = \text{diam}(B_x(\frac{1}{n})) \leq \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore $\widehat{d}_H - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = C$. This proves the density.

(2) As mentioned above, $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is compact by our assumption, then the conclusion follows easily from (1). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.8. $\square$

Remark 2.9. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a complete non-Archimedean metric space. By Theorem 2.8, it is easy to see that $(\mathcal{M}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is complete if and only if all the one-point subsets $\{x\}$ of X are balls, in other words, $(X, \widehat{d})$ is discrete.

Theorem 2.10. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a complete non-Archimedean metric space. If X is separable, then $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is separable. Particularly, if every ball in X contains at least two distinct points, then the converse holds, that is, if $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is separable, then $(X, \widehat{d})$ is separable.

Recall that a topological space is separable if it contains a countable dense subset.

Proof. By Theorem 2.8, we know that $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is complete and $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ is dense in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. So if X is separable, then the collection of its balls is countable (see [Sc, Thm. 19.3, p.51]), i.e., $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ is a countable set, which shows $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$ is separable.

Now we assume that each ball in X has at least two distinct points. Under this condition, we want to show the converse holds. In fact, if $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ is separable, then it contains a countable dense subset S . We assert that $\mathcal{M}_b(X) \subset S$. If otherwise, then there exists a ball B of X such that $B \notin S$. By our assumption, we have

$\text{diam}(B) > 0$. Denote $r = \text{diam}(B)/2$ and let

$$B_B(r) = \{B' \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X) : \widehat{d}_H(B, B') < r\}$$

be the *open* ball in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$ of radius r with center B . Then by Lemma 2.1 one can easily obtain that $B_B(r) = \{B\}$, i.e., B is an isolated point in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. So $B_B(r) \cap S = \emptyset$, a contradiction ! This proves our assertion, so $\mathcal{M}_b(X) \subset S$, and then $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ is countable, which implies that $(X, \widehat{d})$ is separable (see [Sc, Thm. 19.3, p.51]). The proof of Theorem 2.10 is completed. $\square$

Proposition 2.11. Let $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. We define a function ρ_f on $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ by setting $\rho_f(A) = f(\text{diam}(A))$ for each $A \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. Then ρ_f is uniformly continuous.

Proof. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, by the continuity, $\exists \delta > 0$ such that $|f(x) - f(0)|_\infty < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for any real number $x \in [0, \delta)$, where $| \cdot |_\infty$ denotes the usual absolute value of the real number field $\mathbb{R}$. Then for any $A_1, A_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$ satisfying $\widehat{d}_H(A_1, A_2) < \delta$, by Lemma 2.1 one has either $A_1 = A_2$ or $\max\{\text{diam}(A_1), \text{diam}(A_2)\} \leq \widehat{d}_H(A_1, A_2) < \delta$. So either $\rho_f(A_1) = \rho_f(A_2)$ or $|\rho_f(A_1) - \rho_f(A_2)|_\infty = |f(\text{diam}(A_1)) - f(\text{diam}(A_2))|_\infty \leq |f(\text{diam}(A_1)) - f(0)|_\infty + |f(\text{diam}(A_2)) - f(0)|_\infty < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$. This shows that ρ_f is uniformly continuous, and the proof of Proposition 2.11 is completed. $\square$

Definition 2.12. Given a non-Archimedean metric space $(X, \widehat{d})$, in the above Definition 2.5 we have defined two corresponding non-Archimedean metric spaces $(\mathcal{M}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$ and $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X), \widehat{d}_H)$. Now we view the symbols $\mathcal{M}_b$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b$ as operators, and define inductively two sequences of metric spaces $\mathcal{M}_b^{(n)}(X)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X)$ as follows:

Set $\mathcal{M}_b^{(1)}(X) = \mathcal{M}_b(X)$; $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(1)}(X) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$

with the induced Hausdorff distance $\widehat{d}_H^{(1)} = \widehat{d}_H$;

$\mathcal{M}_b^{(2)}(X) = \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{M}_b^{(1)}(X))$; $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(2)}(X) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(1)}(X))$

with the induced Hausdorff distance $\widehat{d}_H^{(2)} = (\widehat{d}_H^{(1)})_H$;

And for general positive integer $n > 1$, set

$\mathcal{M}_b^{(n)}(X) = \mathcal{M}_b(\mathcal{M}_b^{(n-1)}(X))$; $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n-1)}(X))$

with the induced Hausdorff distance $\widehat{d}_H^{(n)} = (\widehat{d}_H^{(n-1)})_H$.

For convenience, we write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(0)}(X) = X = \mathcal{M}_b^{(0)}(X)$. It is easy to know that all $(\mathcal{M}_b^{(n)}(X), \widehat{d}_H^{(n)})$ and $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X), \widehat{d}_H^{(n)})$ are non-Archimedean metric spaces. In particular, if $(X, \widehat{d})$ is complete (resp. compact), then all $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X), \widehat{d}_H^{(n)})$ are complete (resp. compact).

If we set $j_X : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$, $x \mapsto \{x\}$, then obviously $\widehat{d}_H(j_X(x_1), j_X(x_2)) = \widehat{d}(x_1, x_2)$, so j_X is an isometric embedding and X can be viewed as a subspace of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X)$. By this way, for each non-negative integer n , $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X)$ can be viewed as a subspace of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n+1)}(X)$. So we may define the direct limit space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(\infty)}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X)$ endowed with the inductive topology. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(\infty)}(X)$ is a non-Archimedean metric space endowed with the metric $\widehat{d}_H^{(\infty)}$ defined as follows: For any elements $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(\infty)}(X)$, there exists a non-negative integer n such that $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(n)}(X)$, and we define $\widehat{d}_H^{(\infty)}(\alpha, \beta) = \widehat{d}_H^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta)$. Let $\widehat{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}_b^{(\infty)}(X)$ be the completion of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(\infty)}(X)$ under the metric $\widehat{d}_H^{(\infty)}$. A question is

Question 2.13. Is it true that $\widehat{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}_b^{(\infty)}(X) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(\infty)}(X)$, in other words, is $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b^{(\infty)}(X)$ complete ?

3. Ultrametric structures on mappings

For any two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$, let $Z = X \times Y$ be their Cartesian product. As usual, we define a function $\widehat{d}_Z$ on $Z \times Z$ by

$$\widehat{d}_Z((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2), \widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2)\} \quad (\forall (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in Z).$$

Then it is easy to see that $\widehat{d}_Z$ is a non-Archimedean metric on Z , which is called the sup-metric of $\widehat{d}_X$ and $\widehat{d}_Y$ (see [V]). Throughout this paper, for any topological spaces V and W , we denote

$$\mathfrak{M}(V \rightarrow W) = \{\text{all maps } f : V \rightarrow W\},$$

$$\mathfrak{C}(V \rightarrow W) = \{\text{all continuous maps } f : V \rightarrow W\},$$

$$\mathfrak{C}_u(V \rightarrow W) = \{\text{all uniformly continuous maps } f : V \rightarrow W\}.$$

Moreover, for every $f \in \mathfrak{M}(V \rightarrow W)$, we write $\Gamma_f = \{(v, f(v)) : v \in V\} \subset V \times W$, which is the graph of the map f .

Definition 3.1. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. For any $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we define

$$\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) = \widehat{d}_{Z, H}(\Gamma_f, \Gamma_g), \quad \widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) = \sup_{x \in X} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x)),$$

where $Z = X \times Y$ is endowed the sup-metric $\widehat{d}_Z$ of $\widehat{d}_X$ and $\widehat{d}_Y$ defined as above, and $\widehat{d}_{Z, H}$ is the corresponding Hausdorff distance between subsets of Z . We also define for any real number $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\theta_f(\varepsilon) = \sup\{\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) : x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ and } \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) < \varepsilon\} \text{ and}$$

$$\theta_{f, g}(\varepsilon) = \min\{\theta_f(\varepsilon), \theta_g(\varepsilon)\}.$$

Obviously, for any $a \geq 0$, the right-hand limit $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow a^+} \theta_{f, g}(\varepsilon)$ exists, and we denote it by $\theta_{f, g}(a)^+$. From Lemma 2.4 above, $\widehat{\rho}_H$ is a non-Archimedean semi-metric in

$\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, and $(\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)/\widehat{\rho}_H, \widehat{\rho}_H)$ is a non-Archimedean metric space (see [BBI, p.2] for the notation).

Recall that for a map $f \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, its *distorsion* $\text{dis}f$ is defined by

$$\text{dis}f = \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X} | \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) - \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) | \quad (\text{see [BBI], p.249}).$$

Theorem 3.2. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces.

(1) For any $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) &\leq \widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq \max\{\theta_{f,g}(\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g))^+, \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)\}, \text{ and} \\ \theta_{f,g}(\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g))^+ &\leq \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) + \min\{\text{dis}f, \text{dis}g\}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) Let $f_n \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$) and $g \in \mathfrak{C}_u(X \rightarrow Y)$. Then the sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converge uniformly to g if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\rho}_H(f_n, g) = 0$.

Proof. (1) The first inequality follows easily from the definitions. For the second inequality, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, then, for any $x \in X$, by definition, $\varepsilon > \text{dist}((x, f(x)), \Gamma_g) = \inf_{x' \in X} \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x'), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x'))\}$, where $(x, f(x)) \in \Gamma_f$. So there exists a point $x' \in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_X(x', x) < \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) < \varepsilon$. Then

$$\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')), \widehat{d}_Y(g(x'), g(x))\} \leq \max\{\varepsilon, \theta_g(\varepsilon)\},$$

which implies $\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq \max\{\varepsilon, \theta_g(\varepsilon)\}$ because x is arbitrary. Similarly we have $\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq \max\{\varepsilon, \theta_f(\varepsilon)\}$. Therefore we obtain

$$\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq \max\{\varepsilon, \min\{\theta_f(\varepsilon), \theta_g(\varepsilon)\}\} = \max\{\varepsilon, \theta_{f,g}(\varepsilon)\}$$

for arbitrary $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, and the second inequality follows. For the last inequality, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$ with $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) < \varepsilon$, by the definition of $\text{dis}f$,

we have $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) < \varepsilon + \text{dis}f$. So $\theta_f(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon + \text{dis}f$. Similarly, $\theta_g(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon + \text{dis}g$.

Therefore $\theta_{f,g}(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon + \min\{\text{dis}f, \text{dis}g\}$ for all $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, by taking the right-hand limit, the last inequality follows. This proves (1).

(2) If $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converge uniformly to g , then by definition,

$$\widehat{\rho}_s(f_n, g) = \sup_{x \in X} \widehat{d}_Y(f_n(x), g(x)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

So by (1) above, $\widehat{\rho}_H(f_n, g) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Conversely, assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\rho}_H(f_n, g) = 0$. Since g is uniformly continuous, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(g(x_1), g(x_2)) < \varepsilon$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$ with $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) < \delta$. So by definition, $\theta_g(\delta) \leq \varepsilon$. Denote $\varepsilon_0 = \min\{\varepsilon, \delta\}$, then by assumption, there exists a positive integer N such that $\widehat{\rho}_H(f_n, g) < \varepsilon_0$ for all $n > N$. Obviously, $\theta_{f_n, g}(\eta) \leq \theta_g(\eta) \leq \theta_g(\delta) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $\eta : \widehat{\rho}_H(f_n, g) < \eta \leq \varepsilon_0$, which implies that $\theta_{f_n, g}(\widehat{\rho}_H(f_n, g))^+ \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, by (1) above, $\widehat{\rho}_s(f_n, g) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n > N$, which implies that $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converge uniformly to g , this proves (2), and the proof of Theorem 3.2 is completed. $\square$

Remark 3.3. For f, g as in Theorem 3.2(1) above, if one of them is a nonexpanding map (see [BBI], p.9), then it can be easily verified that $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_s(f, g)$.

Definition 3.4. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces.

(1) For any $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we define

$$\widehat{\rho}_b(f, g) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) < \varepsilon \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x'')) < \varepsilon$$

$$\text{for some } x', x'' \in B_x(\varepsilon) \ (\forall x \in X)\}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\widehat{\rho}_b(f, g) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \text{dist}(f(x), g(B_x(\varepsilon))) < \varepsilon \text{ and } \text{dist}(g(x), f(B_x(\varepsilon))) < \varepsilon \\ \text{for all } x \in X\}.$$

(2) For any $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we define

$$\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \text{there exists a } \delta > 0 \text{ such that } \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) \leq \varepsilon \\ \text{and } \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x')) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } x \in X\} \text{ if } f \neq g,$$

$$\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) = 0 \text{ if } f = g.$$

It is easy to see that for $f \neq g$,

$$\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \text{there exists a } \delta > 0 \text{ such that } \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) \leq \varepsilon \\ \text{for all } x, x' \in X \text{ with } \widehat{d}_X(x, x') < \delta\}.$$

For $f \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$ as above, recall that f is called *Lipschitz* if there exists a real number $c \geq 0$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq c \cdot \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$.

The *dilatation* of a Lipschitz map f is defined by

$$\text{dil} f = \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X, x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2))}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)} \quad (\text{see [BBI, p.9] and [G, p.1]}).$$

We denote $\text{dil} f = +\infty$ if f is not a *Lipschitz* map.

Theorem 3.5. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces.

(1) $\widehat{\rho}_u$ is a non-Archimedean metric in $\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, that is, $(\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y), \widehat{\rho}_u)$ is a non-Archimedean metric space.

(2) For any $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we have $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_u(f, g)$. In particular, if both

f and g are nonexpanding, then $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_u(f, g)$.

(3) For any $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we have $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$. Particularly, if either f or g is a Lipschitz map, and $\min\{\text{dil}f, \text{dil}g\} \geq 1$, then

$$\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq \min\{\text{dil}f, \text{dil}g\} \cdot \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g).$$

Proof. (1) Obviously, $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_u(g, f) \geq 0$ for all $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$. If $f \neq g$, then $f(x_0) \neq g(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in X$, so $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_0), g(x_0)) > 0$. Also for any $\delta > 0$, $\sup_{x' \in B_{x_0}(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_0), g(x')) \geq \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_0), g(x_0))$. Hence, by definition, $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) \geq \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_0), g(x_0)) > 0$. Now we come to verify the strong triangle inequality. To see this, let $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$, we may as well assume that $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, h) \geq \widehat{\rho}_u(g, h)$, and we want to show that $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_u(f, h)$. In fact, for any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_u(f, h)$, note that also $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_u(g, h)$, it then follows easily by definition that, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), h(x')) &< \varepsilon, & \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(h(x), f(x')) &< \varepsilon, \\ \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(g(x), h(x')) &< \varepsilon, & \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(h(x), g(x')) &< \varepsilon \quad (\forall x \in X). \end{aligned}$$

Particularly, $\widehat{d}_Y(g(x), h(x)) < \varepsilon$ ($\forall x \in X$). So,

$$\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), h(x')), \widehat{d}_Y(g(x'), h(x'))\} < \varepsilon \quad (\forall x' \in B_x(\delta)),$$

hence $\sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) \leq \varepsilon$, similarly, $\sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x')) \leq \varepsilon$ ($\forall x \in X$), which implies $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) \leq \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_u(f, h)$ is arbitrary, we get $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_u(f, h)$. So the strong triangle inequality holds. This proves (1).

(2) For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_u(f, g)$, by definition, it is easy to see that there is a positive

number $\delta \leq \varepsilon$ such that $\sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) < \varepsilon$ ($\forall x \in X$). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}((x, f(x)), \Gamma_g) &= \inf_{x'' \in X} \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x''), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x''))\} \\ &\leq \sup_{x' \in B_x(\delta)} \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x'), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x'))\} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \quad (\forall x \in X). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\text{dist}((x, g(x)), \Gamma_f) \leq \varepsilon$ ($\forall x \in X$). Therefore, by definition, it follows easily that $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) = \widehat{d}_{Z, H}(\Gamma_f, \Gamma_g) \leq \varepsilon$, which implies $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_u(f, g)$ because $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_u(f, g)$ is arbitrary. Now we assume that f and g are nonexpanding maps. Let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, by definition, $\varepsilon > \text{dist}((x, f(x)), \Gamma_g)$ for all $x \in X$, which implies $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) < \varepsilon$ for some $x' \in B_x(\varepsilon)$ ($\forall x \in X$). Since g is non-expanding, for any $x'' \in B_x(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x'')) &\leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')), \widehat{d}_Y(g(x'), g(x''))\} \\ &\leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')), \widehat{d}_X(x', x'')\} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\sup_{x'' \in B_x(\varepsilon)} \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x'')) \leq \varepsilon$, similarly, $\sup_{x'' \in B_x(\varepsilon)} \widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x'')) \leq \varepsilon$ ($\forall x \in X$). So by definition, $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) \leq \varepsilon$, which implies $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$ because $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$ is arbitrary. Therefore, $\widehat{\rho}_u(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, this proves (2).

(3) Firstly, we verify the equality. For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$, by definition, there exists a positive number $\eta < \varepsilon$ such that, for every $x \in X$, $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) < \eta$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x'')) < \eta$ for some $x', x'' \in B_x(\eta)$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}((x, f(x)), \Gamma_g) &= \inf_{x_2 \in X} \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x_2), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x_2))\} < \eta < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \\ \text{dist}((x, g(x)), \Gamma_f) &= \inf_{x_1 \in X} \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), g(x))\} < \eta < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by definition, $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) = \widehat{d}_{X \times Y, H}(\Gamma_f, \Gamma_g) < \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$, and so $\widehat{\rho}_H(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$. Conversely, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$, then, for every $x \in X$, there exist

$x', x'' \in X$ such that

$$\max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x'), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x'))\} < \varepsilon \text{ and } \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x''), \widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x''))\} < \varepsilon,$$

so $x', x'' \in B_x(\varepsilon)$, $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), g(x')) < \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x'')) < \varepsilon$. Then by definition, $\varepsilon \geq \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$, and so $\widehat{\rho}_b(f, g) \leq \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$ because $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$ is arbitrary. Therefore, $\widehat{\rho}_b(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$.

Next, we come to verify the inequality. We may assume that $1 \leq \text{dil}f \leq \text{dil}g$. Denote $c = \text{dil}f$, we only need to show that $\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq c \cdot \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$. To see this, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$, by definition, for every $x \in X$, there exists a $x' \in B_x(\varepsilon)$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x')) < \varepsilon$. Then by the definition of $\text{dil}f$, we get

$$\widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(g(x), f(x')), \widehat{d}_Y(f(x'), f(x))\} < \max\{\varepsilon, c \cdot \varepsilon\} = c \cdot \varepsilon,$$

which implies that $\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq c \cdot \varepsilon$, and so $\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) \leq c \cdot \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$ because $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_b(f, g)$ is arbitrary. This proves (3), and the proof of Theorem 3.5 is completed. $\square$

Note that, for f, g as in the above Theorem 3.5(3), if $\min\{\text{dil}f, \text{dil}g\} \leq 1$, we may as well assume that $\text{dil}f \leq 1$, then f is a non-expanding map, so from the above Remark 3.3, we know that $\widehat{\rho}_s(f, g) = \widehat{\rho}_H(f, g)$.

4. Ultrametric structures on ball-type mappings

Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces, recall that $\mathcal{M}_b(X) = \{\text{all balls in } X\}$ is a non-Archimedean metric space with the metric $\widehat{d}_{X,H}$ as before. We denote

$$\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y) = \{\text{all maps } P : \mathcal{M}_b(X) \rightarrow Y\} = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{M}_b(X) \rightarrow Y).$$

for any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, recall that

$$\widehat{\rho}_H(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{d}_{W,H}(\Gamma_{P_1}, \Gamma_{P_2}), \quad \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)),$$

where $W = \mathcal{M}_b(X) \times Y$ is endowed the sup-metric $\widehat{d}_W$ of $\widehat{d}_{X,H}$ and $\widehat{d}_Y$ defined before. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, for convenience, we will write $B^\varepsilon = U_\varepsilon(B)$, the ε -neighborhood of a ball B in X . Note that by Lemma 2.3 above, B^ε is also a ball in X . For all spaces considered in the following, we assume that every ball in them contains at least two distinct elements.

Definition 4.1. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. For any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$ and $\lambda > 0$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon})) \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon})) \leq \varepsilon \\ \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)\} \text{ if } P_1 \neq P_2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) = 0 \text{ if } P_1 = P_2;$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \text{for every } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X), \text{ there exist positive numbers} \\ \varepsilon_B, \varepsilon'_B \leq \varepsilon \text{ such that } \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B})) \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'_B})) \leq \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $\lambda = 1$, we write $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^1 = \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*1} = \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^*$. By definition, it is easy to see that $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2)$ ($\forall P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$). Moreover, for any $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, if we denote

$$\eta_{\lambda,P} = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^{\lambda\varepsilon})) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)\},$$

then it can be easily verified that $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) \geq \max\{\eta_{\lambda,P_1}, \eta_{\lambda,P_2}\}$ for all $P_1, P_2 \in$

$\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$. We also denote

$$\mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda)}(X, Y) = \{P \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y) : \widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^{\lambda\varepsilon})) \leq \varepsilon$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)\}$.

Obviously, $\eta_{\lambda, P} = 0$ for all $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda)}(X, Y)$. Note that, if $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$ is non-expanding, then $\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \widehat{d}_{X, H}(B, B^\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$, so $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$. Hence $\mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$ contains all nonexpanding maps from $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ to Y .

Theorem 4.2. (1) The above defined functions $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^{*\lambda}$ are all non-Archimedean metrics on $\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$.

(2) For any $\lambda > 0$ and $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, we have

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), \quad \widehat{\rho}_H(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{1, \lambda\} \cdot \widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2).$$

In particular, if $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$, then

$$\widehat{\rho}_H(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2).$$

(3) For $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$ and a sequence $\{P_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, the following statements are equivalent:

(A) $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_n, P) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(B) $\sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in other words, P_n converges uniformly to P as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. (1) We only verify $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda$, the other is similar. By definition, $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_2, P_1) \geq 0$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_1) = 0$ ($\forall P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$). Now suppose $P_1 \neq P_2$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) = 0$ for some P_1, P_2 , then, for any $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ and positive number $\varepsilon \leq \text{diam}(B)/\lambda$, it follows easily from the definition of $\widehat{\beta}_{X, Y}^\lambda$ that

$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$ for some positive number $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$. Since $\lambda\varepsilon' < \lambda\varepsilon \leq \text{diam}(B)$, by Lemma 2.3 above, we have $B^{\lambda\varepsilon'} = B$, which implies $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) < \varepsilon$, and then $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) = 0$ because $\varepsilon \leq \text{diam}(B)/\lambda$ is arbitrary. Hence, $P_1(B) = P_2(B) \ (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X))$, and so $P_1 = P_2$, a contradiction ! Therefore, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) > 0$ if $P_1 \neq P_2$. Lastly, we come to verify the strong triangle inequality. Let $P_1, P_2, P_3 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, for any $\varepsilon > \max\{\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_2, P_3)\}$, by definition, there exist positive numbers $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1})) &\leq \varepsilon_1, \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1})) \leq \varepsilon_1; \\ \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_3(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) &\leq \varepsilon_2, \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_3(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) \leq \varepsilon_2 \ (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).\end{aligned}$$

We may as well assume that $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2$. Then by Lemma 2.3 above, $(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})^{\lambda\varepsilon_1} = (B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1})^{\lambda\varepsilon_2} = B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2}), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) &= \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2}), P_1((B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})^{\lambda\varepsilon_1})) \leq \varepsilon_1; \\ \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1}), P_3(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) &= \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1}), P_3((B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1})^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) \leq \varepsilon_2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_3(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_1}), P_3(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2}))\} \leq \max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\} \leq \varepsilon_2$. Similarly, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_3(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_2})) \leq \varepsilon_2$. Therefore, by definition, we obtain that $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_2 \geq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_3)$, and so $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_3) \leq \max\{\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_2, P_3)\}$ by the arbitrary choice of ε . This proves (1).

(2) We first verify $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$. We may assume $P_1 \neq P_2$, and write $\varepsilon_0 = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, then $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. For every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, let $\varepsilon_B = \min\{\text{diam}B/\lambda, \varepsilon_0\}$,

then by Lemma 2.3, we have $B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B} = B$. So

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) = \varepsilon_0,$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B)) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) = \varepsilon_0,$$

and the inequality follows by definition.

Next we verify $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2)$. We may assume $P_1 \neq P_2$. For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2)$, by definition, there exists a positive number $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' \text{ } (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

In particular, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'}), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'}), P_1((B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})^{\lambda\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$ (see Lemma 2.3 above). So

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'}), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'}))\} \leq \varepsilon',$$

and then $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'}), P_2(B))\} \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$), which implies $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$, and so $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2)$ by the arbitrary choice of ε .

Next we verify $\widehat{\rho}_H(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{1, \lambda\} \cdot \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2)$. For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2)$, by definition, there is a positive number $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B})) \leq \varepsilon_1$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'_B})) \leq \varepsilon_1$ for some positive numbers $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon'_B \leq \varepsilon_1$ ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$).

By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 above, we have $\widehat{d}_{X,H}(B, B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B}) \leq \lambda\varepsilon_B < \lambda\varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_{X,H}(B, B^{\lambda\varepsilon'_B}) \leq \lambda\varepsilon'_B < \lambda\varepsilon$, so $B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B}, B^{\lambda\varepsilon'_B} \in B_B(\lambda\varepsilon)$, a ball in the space $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$.

Hence by Definition 3.4(1) above, $\widehat{\rho}_b(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{1, \lambda\}\varepsilon$. Since ε is arbitrary, by

Theorem 3.5(3) above, we obtain $\widehat{\rho}_H(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_b(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{1, \lambda\} \cdot \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2)$.

Lastly, assume $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$, we come to verify the equalities. By the

above discussion and Theorem 3.5(3), we only need to show that $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\rho}_b(P_1, P_2)$. To see this, for any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_b(P_1, P_2)$, by definition, there is a positive number $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$ such that, for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, there exist $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ satisfying $\widehat{d}_{X,H}(B, B_1) < \varepsilon_1$, $\widehat{d}_{X,H}(B, B_2) < \varepsilon_1$, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B_1)) < \varepsilon_1$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B_2)) < \varepsilon_1$. Then by the above Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3, it can be easily verified that $B_1^\varepsilon = B_2^\varepsilon = B^\varepsilon$. Since $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_2), P_1(B^\varepsilon)) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_2), P_1(B_2^\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon,$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B_1), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B_1), P_2(B_1^\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon. \quad \text{So}$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B_1)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B_1), P_2(B^\varepsilon))\} \leq \varepsilon \text{ and}$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B_2)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_2), P_1(B^\varepsilon))\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence by definition, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\rho}_b(P_1, P_2)$ because $\varepsilon > \widehat{\rho}_b(P_1, P_2)$ is arbitrary. This proves (2).

(3) (A) $\Rightarrow$ (B). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a positive integer N such that, for every integer $n > N$ we have $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_n, P) < \varepsilon$. By definition, there exists a positive number $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B^{\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X))$. Since $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$, we have $\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^{\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$, so

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B^{\varepsilon'})), \widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^{\varepsilon'}))\} \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Therefore $\sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B)) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$.

(B) $\Rightarrow$ (A). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a positive integer N such that, for every integer $n > N$ we have $\sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B)) < \varepsilon$. Since $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y)$, we have

$\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon$ ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$). So

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B)), \widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\varepsilon))\} \leq \varepsilon \text{ and}$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P_n(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\varepsilon)), \widehat{d}_Y(P(B^\varepsilon), P_n(B^\varepsilon))\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence by definition, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_n, P) \leq \varepsilon$. This proves (3), and the proof of Theorem 4.2

is completed. $\square$

Note that for P, P_n in Theorem 4.2.(3) above, if $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, then

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_n, P) \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \widehat{d}_Y(P_n(B), P(B)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ } (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

Lemma 4.3. On the interval $(0, \infty)$, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda$ is a monotonic increasing function in the variable λ , and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}$ is a monotonic decreasing function in the variable λ .

Proof. We only verify the case $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda$, the other can be similarly done. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, \infty)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. For any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$ with $P_1 \neq P_2$, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{\lambda_2}(P_1, P_2)$, by definition and Theorem 4.2.(2), there is a positive number $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that $\varepsilon' \geq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$ ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$). Note that by Lemma 2.3, $B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}, (B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'} = B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'} \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, so

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}), P_2(B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}), P_2((B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon',$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}), P_1(B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}), P_1((B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Also by definition, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}), P_2(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon'$. Hence

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})) \leq$$

$$\max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda_2 \varepsilon'}), P_1(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}), P_2(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'}))\} \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Similarly, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda_1 \varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$. Therefore, by definition, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{\lambda_1}(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$,

which implies $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{\lambda_1}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{\lambda_2}(P_1, P_2)$ by the arbitrary choice of ε . The proof is completed. $\square$

Now for any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) &= \inf_{\lambda>0} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), & \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), \\ \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2) &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2), & \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2) &= \inf_{\lambda>0} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.2 above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), & \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2), \\ \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2), & \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2), \\ \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2) &\leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2).\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.2 above, it is not difficult to show that all $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0, \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty, \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}$ are non-Archimedean metrics on $\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$.

For the set $\mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda)}(X, Y)$ defined in Definition 4.1 above, it is easy to verify that $\mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda_2)}(X, Y) \subset \mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda_1)}(X, Y)$ for any positive numbers $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. So particularly, we have a descending chain $\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y) \supset \mathfrak{D}_b^{(1)}(X, Y) \supset \mathfrak{D}_b^{(2)}(X, Y) \supset \dots$. We denote

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{D}_b^{(\infty)}(X, Y) &= \bigcap_{\lambda>0} \mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda)}(X, Y), & \mathfrak{D}_b^{(0)}(X, Y) &= \bigcup_{\lambda>0} \mathfrak{D}_b^{(\lambda)}(X, Y), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)_0 &= \{P \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y) : P \text{ is a constant map from } \mathcal{M}_b(X) \text{ to } Y\}.\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)_0 \subset \mathfrak{D}_b^{(\infty)}(X, Y)$.

Definition 4.4. Let $P, P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

(1) If there exists an $\delta > 0$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\delta)) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, then we call that P is ε -admissible. We define $d_a(P) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : P \text{ is } \varepsilon\text{-admissible}\}$,

and call $d_a(P)$ the admissible degree of P . We also denote

$$C_\varepsilon(P) = \sup\{\delta > 0 : \widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\delta)) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)\},$$

$$C(P) = \inf\{C_\varepsilon(P) : P \text{ is } \varepsilon\text{-admissible}\},$$

$$\widehat{h}_{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}(B) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) \quad \text{for each } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X),$$

$$\widehat{h}(P) = \inf_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{h}_{P \rightarrow P}(B), \quad \widehat{H}(P) = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{h}_{P \rightarrow P}(B), \text{ and}$$

$$\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \max\{\widehat{h}_{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}(B), \widehat{h}_{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}(B)\}.$$

(2) Assume $P_1 \neq P_2$, we define

$$O_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \{\delta > 0 : \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\delta)) \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^\delta)) \leq \varepsilon \\ \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)\},$$

$$\omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \inf\{\delta : \delta \in O_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2)\}, \quad \Omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \sup\{\delta : \delta \in O_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2)\},$$

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \Omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \infty\}.$$

We denote $\omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \Omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = 0$ if $O_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \emptyset$, and $\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) = \infty$ if

$\Omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, $\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) = 0$ if $P_1 = P_2$.

(3) We define

$$O_\varepsilon^*(P_1 \rightarrow P_2) = \{\delta > 0 : \text{for every } B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X), \text{ there exist a positive number}$$

$$\delta_B \leq \delta \text{ such that } \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\delta_B})) \leq \varepsilon\},$$

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}^*(P_1, P_2) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : O_\varepsilon^*(P_1 \rightarrow P_2) \cap O_\varepsilon^*(P_2 \rightarrow P_1) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

It is easy to verify that

(1) P is ε -admissible for any $\varepsilon > d_a(P)$.

(2) For any $\lambda \in (0, C(P))$ and $\varepsilon \in (d_a(P), \infty)$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\lambda)) < \varepsilon \quad (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

Theorem 4.5. Let $P, P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$.

(1) If P is a Lipschitz map, then $d_a(P) = 0$.

(2) $\max\{\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\} = \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) = \max\{\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}$.

(3) If for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, the cardinal $\#\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^\varepsilon), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) : \varepsilon > 0\} > 1$, then $\max\{\widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\} = \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2)$.

Proof. (1) Since P is a Lipschitz map, there exists a number $c \geq 0$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(P(B_1), P(B_2)) \leq c \cdot \widehat{d}_{X,H}(B_1, B_2)$ ($\forall B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$). If $c = 0$, then obviously $d_a(P) = 0$. Now we assume $c > 0$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3, it follows easily that $\widehat{d}_{X,H}(B, B^\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$, so $\widehat{d}_Y(P(B), P(B^\varepsilon)) \leq c \cdot \widehat{d}_{X,H}(B, B^\varepsilon) \leq c\varepsilon$ ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$). Hence P is $c\varepsilon$ -admissible, and so $d_a(P) \leq c\varepsilon$, which implies $d_a(P) = 0$, this proves (1).

(2) We may assume $P_1 \neq P_2$. By definition, one can easily verify that $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2)$ and $\widehat{H}(P_i) \leq \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Now let

$\delta > \max\{\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}$, then for every $\lambda > 0$, we have $\delta > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2)$,

so there exists a positive number $\delta(\lambda) < \delta$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\delta(\lambda)})) \leq \delta(\lambda) \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\delta(\lambda)})) \leq \delta(\lambda) \quad (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

Hence for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) &\leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\delta(\lambda)})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\delta(\lambda)}), P_2(B^\varepsilon))\} \\ &\leq \max\{\delta, \widehat{H}(P_2)\}, \text{ so } \widehat{h}_{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}(B) \leq \max\{\delta, \widehat{H}(P_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\widehat{h}_{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}(B) \leq \max\{\delta, \widehat{H}(P_1)\}$.

Therefore $\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{\delta, \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\} = \delta$, which implies

$\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}$, and the first equality holds.

For the second equality, by the above discussion, we only need to show that $\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}$. To see this, let $\delta > \max\{\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}$, then for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, we have

$$\delta > \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta > \widehat{d}_Y(P_i(B), P_i(B^\varepsilon)) \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0 \ (i = 1, 2).$$

$$\text{So } \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_2(B^\varepsilon))\} < \delta.$$

Hence $\widehat{h}_{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}(B) \leq \delta$. Similarly, $\widehat{h}_{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}(B) \leq \delta$. Therefore $\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) \leq \delta$, which implies $\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) \leq \max\{\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}$. This proves (2).

(3) For every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, by assumption, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^\varepsilon), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) \neq \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)). \text{ We may as well assume that}$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^\varepsilon), P_2(B^\varepsilon)) < \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)). \text{ Then by the inequality}$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_1(B^\varepsilon)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B^\varepsilon), P_2(B^\varepsilon)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^\varepsilon), P_2(B))\},$$

we get

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_1(B^\varepsilon)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_2(B^\varepsilon))\}$$

$$\leq \max\{\widehat{h}_{P_1 \rightarrow P_1}(B), \widehat{h}_{P_2 \rightarrow P_2}(B)\}. \text{ Therefore}$$

$$\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \max\{\widehat{h}_{P_1 \rightarrow P_1}(B), \widehat{h}_{P_2 \rightarrow P_2}(B)\} = \max\{\widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\}. \text{ Now}$$

we may as well assume that $\widehat{H}(P_1) \leq \widehat{H}(P_2)$. Then for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\delta)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B)), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_2(B^\delta))\}$$

$$\leq \max\{\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2), \widehat{H}(P_2)\} = \widehat{H}(P_2), \quad \text{similarly, } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^\delta)) \leq \widehat{H}(P_2), \text{ which}$$

implies $\widehat{H}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{H}(P_2)$, so the equality holds. This proves (3), and the proof of

Theorem 4.5 is completed. $\square$

Theorem 4.6. Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$ with $P_1 \neq P_2$. We have

$$(1) \quad \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \iff \max\{d_a(P_1), d_a(P_2)\} \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2).$$

$$(2) \quad \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2).$$

$$(3) \quad \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2).$$

$$(4) \quad \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}^*(P_1, P_2).$$

Proof. (1) If $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\lambda \in (0, \delta)$, we have $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) < \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) + \varepsilon$. By definition, there exists a positive number $\varepsilon(\lambda) : \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda) < \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) + \varepsilon$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda)$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda)$ ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$). So $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)})) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)}), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)}))\} \leq \varepsilon(\lambda)$. Similarly, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda)$. So both P_1 and P_2 are $\varepsilon(\lambda)$ -admissible. Hence by definition, we get $\max\{d_a(P_1), d_a(P_2)\} \leq \varepsilon(\lambda) < \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) + \varepsilon$, which implies $\max\{d_a(P_1), d_a(P_2)\} \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$ by the arbitrary choice of ε .

Conversely, if $\max\{d_a(P_1), d_a(P_2)\} \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, then we need to show that

$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$. If otherwise, then $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) > \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$. Take $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) + \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2))$, then $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) < \varepsilon_0 < \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2)$. So for every $\lambda > 0$, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) > \varepsilon_0$, and then there exists a $B_\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_\lambda), P_2(B_\lambda^{\lambda\varepsilon_0})) > \varepsilon_0 \text{ or } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B_\lambda), P_1(B_\lambda^{\lambda\varepsilon_0})) > \varepsilon_0.$$

On the other hand, we have $d_a(P_i) < \varepsilon_0$, $i = 1, 2$. So by definition, there exist positive numbers $\varepsilon_i < \varepsilon_0$ such that P_i are ε_i -admissible, i.e., there exist positive numbers δ_i such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_i(B), P_i(B^{\delta_i})) \leq \varepsilon_i \quad (i = 1, 2) \quad (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

Now take a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that $\lambda_0\varepsilon_0 < \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. Then by Lemma 2.3, $(B^{\lambda_0\varepsilon_0})^{\delta_i} = B^{\delta_i}$, so

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_i(B), P_i(B^{\lambda_0\varepsilon_0})) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_i(B), P_i(B^{\delta_i})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_i((B^{\lambda_0\varepsilon_0})^{\delta_i}), P_i(B^{\lambda_0\varepsilon_0}))\} \leq \varepsilon_i$$

$(i = 1, 2) \ (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X))$.

In particular, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_i(B_{\lambda_0}), P_i(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0})) \leq \varepsilon_i < \varepsilon_0 \ (i = 1, 2)$.

Since $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0}), P_2(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0})) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) < \varepsilon_0$, we get

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_{\lambda_0}), P_2(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0})) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_{\lambda_0}), P_1(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0})), \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0}), P_2(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0}))\} <$$

ε_0 , similarly, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B_{\lambda_0}), P_1(B_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_0 \varepsilon_0})) < \varepsilon_0$, a contradiction! Hence we must have

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2). \text{ This proves (1).}$$

(2) For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2)$, by Lemma 4.3, $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) \ (\forall \lambda > 0)$. So for

every $\lambda > 0$, by definition, there exists a positive number $\varepsilon(\lambda) < \varepsilon$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda \varepsilon(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda) \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda \varepsilon(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda) \ (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

So $\lambda \varepsilon(\lambda) \in O_{\varepsilon(\lambda)}(P_1, P_2) \subset O_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2)$. Then by Theorem 4.2.(2), we have $\varepsilon(\lambda) \geq$

$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) \geq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$. Since $P_1 \neq P_2$, it is easy to see that $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) > 0$. Hence

$\lambda \varepsilon(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, which implies that $\Omega_\varepsilon(P_1, P_2) = \infty$. Then by definition,

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon, \text{ and so } \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) \text{ by the arbitrary choice of } \varepsilon.$$

Conversely, for any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2)$, by definition, there exists a positive number

$\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that $\Omega_{\varepsilon'}(P_1, P_2) = \infty$, in particular, $O_{\varepsilon'}(P_1, P_2) \neq \emptyset$. Then, for any

$\lambda > 0$, there exists an $\delta \in O_{\varepsilon'}(P_1, P_2) \cap (\lambda \varepsilon, \infty)$. By definition,

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^\delta)) \leq \varepsilon' \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^\delta)) \leq \varepsilon' \ (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

Let $\lambda' = \delta/\varepsilon$, then $\lambda' > \lambda$, and

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda' \varepsilon})) < \varepsilon \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda' \varepsilon})) < \varepsilon \ (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$

So $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{\lambda'}(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon$, and then by Lemma 4.3, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon$, which implies

$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\infty(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}(P_1, P_2)$, and the equality holds,

this proves (2).

(3) By Theorem 4.2.(2), $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$. As in the proof of (2) above,

$\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) > 0$. For any positive number $\varepsilon < \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, by definition, there exists a $B_0 \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_0), P_2(B_0)) > \varepsilon$. Denote $\delta = \text{diam} B_0 / (2\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)) > 0$, and take a $\lambda \in (0, \delta)$. Then for any $\varepsilon_1 \in (\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2), 2\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2))$, there exists an $\varepsilon'_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon'_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'_B(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon'_1$$

with some $\varepsilon_B(\lambda), \varepsilon'_B(\lambda) \in (0, \varepsilon'_1]$ for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$. In particular,

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_0), P_2(B_0^{\lambda\varepsilon_{B_0}(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon'_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B_0), P_1(B_0^{\lambda\varepsilon'_{B_0}(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon'_1.$$

Since $\lambda\varepsilon_{B_0}(\lambda) \leq \lambda\varepsilon'_1 < \lambda\varepsilon_1 < 2\lambda\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) < 2\delta\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) = \text{diam} B_0$, by Lemma 2.3, $B_0^{\lambda\varepsilon_{B_0}(\lambda)} = B_0$, so $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_0), P_2(B_0)) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_0), P_2(B_0^{\lambda\varepsilon_{B_0}(\lambda)})) \leq \varepsilon'_1 < \varepsilon_1$.

Since ε_1 is arbitrary chosen, we get $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B_0), P_2(B_0)) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2)$, hence $\varepsilon < \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2)$, which implies $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*0}(P_1, P_2)$, and the equality holds. This proves (3).

(4) For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2)$, there exists an $\lambda > 0$ such that $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}(P_1, P_2) < \varepsilon$. By definition, there exists an $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda\varepsilon_B})) \leq \varepsilon' \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda\varepsilon'_B})) \leq \varepsilon'$$

with some $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon'_B \in (0, \varepsilon']$ for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$. So $\lambda\varepsilon' \in O_{\varepsilon'}^*(P_1 \rightarrow P_2) \cap O_{\varepsilon'}^*(P_2 \rightarrow P_1)$, and then $\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}^*(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$, which implies $\widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}^*(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2)$.

Conversely, for any $\varepsilon > \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}^*(P_1, P_2)$, there exists an $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that $O_{\varepsilon'}^*(P_1 \rightarrow P_2) \cap O_{\varepsilon'}^*(P_2 \rightarrow P_1) \neq \emptyset$. Let δ be a positive number in this intersection set, then, for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, there exist $\delta_B, \delta'_B \in (0, \delta]$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\delta_B})) \leq \varepsilon' \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\delta'_B})) \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Take $\lambda_0 = \delta/\varepsilon'$, $\varepsilon_B = \delta_B/\lambda_0$ and $\varepsilon'_B = \delta'_B/\lambda_0$, then $\lambda_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_B \leq \varepsilon'$, $\varepsilon'_B \leq \varepsilon'$, and from $\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{\lambda_0\varepsilon_B})) \leq \varepsilon'$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{\lambda_0\varepsilon'_B})) \leq \varepsilon'$ ($\forall B \in$

$\mathcal{M}_b(X)$), we get $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda_0}(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$, which implies $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\infty}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\Omega}_{X,Y}^*(P_1, P_2)$, and the equality holds. This proves (4), and the proof of Theorem 4.6 is completed. $\square$

Corollary 4.7. Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$.

- (1) If both P_1 and P_2 are Lipschitz maps, then $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$.
- (2) If $\max\{\widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\} < \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2)$, then for every $\lambda > 0$, we have $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2)$.
- (3) If $\max\{d_a(P_1), d_a(P_2)\} > \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, then $\max\{\widehat{H}(P_1), \widehat{H}(P_2)\} = \widehat{H}(P_1, P_2)$.

Proof. (1) follows from Theorem 4.5.(1) and Theorem 4.6.(1).

(2) follows from Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.5.(2).

(3) follows from Theorem 4.5.(2) and Theorem 4.6.(1). $\square$

Example 4.8. Let $X = \mathbb{C}_p$ be the Tate field with the canonical p -adic metric $\widehat{d}_p$ as above. It is well known that $|\mathbb{C}_p|_p = p^{\mathbb{Q}}$ (see [Sc], p.45), and it follows that $\text{diam} B_a(r) = r$ for any $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$ and $r > 0$. Now we define two maps $P_i : \mathcal{M}_b(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ ($i = 1, 2$) as follows:

We define $P_1(B) = B^{1/\text{diam} B}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$; and $P_2(B) = P_1(B)$ if $B \neq B_0(1)$, while $P_2(B_0(1)) = B_0(2)$.

We assert that $d_a(P_1) = \infty$, that is, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, P_1 is not ε -admissible. To see this, for any $\delta > 0$, take a positive number $r < \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\}$, denote $\delta_0 = \max\{\delta, \frac{1}{\delta}\}$ and let $B = B_0(r)$. Then by Lemma 2.3, $P_1(B) = P_1(B_0(r)) = B^{1/r} = B_0(1/r)$ and $P_1(B^\delta) = P_1(B_0(\delta)) = B_0(\delta)^{1/\delta} = B_0(\delta_0)$. So by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\widehat{d}_{p,H}(P_1(B), P_1(B^\delta)) = \widehat{d}_{p,H}(B_0(1/r), B_0(\delta_0)) = 1/r > \varepsilon. \text{ Therefore, } d_a(P_1) = \infty.$$

On the other hand, by the above definition and Lemma 2.1, we have $\widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2) =$

$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} \widehat{d}_{p,H}(P_1(B), P_2(B)) = \widehat{d}_{p,H}(P_1(B_0(1)), P_2(B_0(1))) = \widehat{d}_{p,H}(B_0(1), B_0(2)) = 2$. Hence $d_a(P_1) > \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$, so by Theorem 4.6.(1), we get $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^0(P_1, P_2) > \widehat{\rho}_s(P_1, P_2)$ with $Y = \mathcal{M}_b(X) = \mathcal{M}_b(\mathbb{C}_p)$. $\square$

Now let K be a complete non-Archimedean valued field with absolute value $|\cdot|$, and X be a non-Archimedean normed linear space over K with norm $\|\cdot\|$ (see [FP], chapter 1). As before, $K^\times = K \setminus \{0\}$. Let $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be a non-Archimedean metric space. For $a \in K^\times$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, it is easy to see that $a \cdot B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, more precisely, $a \cdot B_b(r) = B_{ab}(|a|r)$ and $a \cdot \overline{B}_b(r) = \overline{B}_{ab}(|a|r)$ ($b \in X$ and $r > 0$). Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $(a \cdot B)^\varepsilon = a \cdot B^{\varepsilon/|a|}$. Here $a \cdot B = \{a \cdot v : v \in B\}$. For $P \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$, we define $P^a(B) = P(a \cdot B)$, and when $Y = K$, we also define $(aP)(B) = a \cdot P(B)$. Obviously, $P^a \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$. When $Y = K$, we also have $aP \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$.

Theorem 4.9. let $(K, |\cdot|)$ be a complete non-Archimedean valued field, $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a non-Archimedean normed linear space over K , and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be a non-Archimedean metric space. For any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, Y)$ and $a \in K^\times$, we have

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{|a|}(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1^a, P_2^a) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*|a|}(P_1, P_2) = \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^*(P_1^a, P_2^a).$$

In particular, if $Y = K$, then we have

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{|a|}(P_1, P_2) = |a|^{-1} \cdot \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(aP_1, aP_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*|a|}(P_1, P_2) = |a|^{-1} \cdot \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^*(aP_1, aP_2).$$

Proof. For the first equality, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{|a|}(P_1, P_2)$. Then there exists a positive number $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{|a|\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{|a|\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' \quad (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)).$$
 So

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1^a(B), P_2^a(B^{\varepsilon'})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(a \cdot B), P_2((a \cdot B)^{|a|\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon',$$

similarly, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2^a(B), P_1^a(B^{\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$, which implies $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1^a, P_2^a) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$, and so

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1^a, P_2^a) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{|a|}(P_1, P_2).$$

Conversely, let $\varepsilon > \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1^a, P_2^a)$, then there exists a positive number $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1^a(B), P_2^a(B^{\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' \text{ and } \widehat{d}_Y(P_2^a(B), P_1^a(B^{\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon' \text{ } (\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)). \text{ So}$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{|a|\varepsilon'})) = \widehat{d}_Y(P_1^a(a^{-1}B), P_2^a((a^{-1}B)^{\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon',$$

similarly, $\widehat{d}_Y(P_2(B), P_1(B^{|a|\varepsilon'})) \leq \varepsilon'$, which implies $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{|a|}(P_1, P_2) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$, and so

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{|a|}(P_1, P_2) \leq \widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}(P_1^a, P_2^a). \text{ So the first equality holds. The second equality can}$$

be similarly done.

For the case $Y = K$, note that $\widehat{d}_Y((aP_1)(B), (aP_2)(B)) = |a| \cdot |P_1(B) - P_2(B)|$, so

$$\widehat{d}_Y((aP_1)(B), (aP_2)(B^\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon \iff \widehat{d}_Y(P_1(B), P_2(B^{|a|\cdot\varepsilon/|a|})) \leq \varepsilon/|a|. \text{ Then the other}$$

two equalities follows easily by the definition. The proof is completed. $\square$

Recall that a non-Archimedean valued ring is a commutative ring A with a non-Archimedean absolute value $|\cdot|$, i.e., a function $|\cdot| : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the rules:

1. $|a| \geq 0$ and $|a| = 0 \iff a = 0$.
2. $|ab| = |a| \cdot |b|$.
3. $|a + b| \leq \max\{|a|, |b|\}$.

If $A = K$ is a field, then $(K, |\cdot|)$ is a non-Archimedean valued field as before (see [BGR] and [FP]). Now let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ be a non-Archimedean metric space. For $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow A)$ and $a \in A$, we set $(f + g)(x) = f(x) + g(x)$, $(af)(x) = af(x)$, and $(fg)(x) = f(x) \cdot g(x)$ ($\forall x \in X$). Then obviously $\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow A)$ is a commutative A -algebra.

Definition 4.10. let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ be a non-Archimedean metric space, $(A, |\cdot|)$ be a non-Archimedean valued ring, we define

$$\widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A) = \{f \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow A) : \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty\} \text{ with } \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} = \max\{\|f\|_\infty, \text{dil}(f)\},$$

where $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$ is the supremum norm and $\text{dil}(f)$ is the dilatation of

f as above.

Theorem 4.11. $\widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$ is an A -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow A)$, and as an A -module, $\|\cdot\|_{\widehat{BL}}$ is a non-Archimedean norm on it. Moreover, for any $f, g \in \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$, we have $\|fg\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \cdot \|g\|_{\widehat{BL}}$.

Proof. For $f, g \in \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$ and $a \in A$, it follows easily by definition that $\|f + g\|_{\infty} \leq \max\{\|f\|_{\infty}, \|g\|_{\infty}\} < \infty$ and $\|af\|_{\infty} = |a| \cdot \|f\|_{\infty} < \infty$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dil}(f + g) &= \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ and } x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{|(f(x_1) - f(x_2)) + (g(x_1) - g(x_2))|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)} \\ &\leq \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ and } x_1 \neq x_2} \max\left\{\frac{|f(x_1) - f(x_2)|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)}, \frac{|g(x_1) - g(x_2)|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)}\right\} \\ &\leq \max\{\text{dil}(f), \text{dil}(g)\} < \infty, \quad \text{and} \\ \text{dil}(af) &= \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ and } x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{|af(x_1) - af(x_2)|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)} = |a| \cdot \text{dil}(f) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

So $\|f + g\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty$ and $\|af\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty$, and so $f + g, af \in \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$.

From the above discussion, we also get $\|f + g\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq \max\{\|f\|_{\widehat{BL}}, \|g\|_{\widehat{BL}}\}$ and $\|af\|_{\widehat{BL}} = |a| \cdot \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}}$. Moreover, it is obvious that $\|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \geq 0$ and $\|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} = 0$ if and only if $f = 0$. Therefore, as an A -module, $\|\cdot\|_{\widehat{BL}}$ is a non-Archimedean norm on $\widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$.

Now we come to show that $\|fg\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \cdot \|g\|_{\widehat{BL}}$. In fact, since

$$\begin{aligned} \|fg\|_{\infty} &= \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| \cdot |g(x)| \leq \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| \cdot \sup_{x \in X} |g(x)| = \|f\|_{\infty} \cdot \|g\|_{\infty} \text{ and} \\ \text{dil}(fg) &= \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ and } x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{|(f(x_1) - f(x_2))g(x_2) + f(x_1)(g(x_1) - g(x_2))|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)} \\ &\leq \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ and } x_1 \neq x_2} \max\left\{\frac{|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \cdot |g(x_2)|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)}, \frac{|f(x_1)| \cdot |g(x_1) - g(x_2)|}{\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2)}\right\} \\ &\leq \max\{\|g\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{dil}(f), \|f\|_{\infty} \cdot \text{dil}(g)\}, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that $\|fg\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq \max\{\|f\|_{\infty}, \text{dil}(f)\} \cdot \max\{\|g\|_{\infty}, \text{dil}(g)\} = \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \cdot \|g\|_{\widehat{BL}}$.

In particular, $\|fg\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty$, so $fg \in \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$, which implies that $\widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow A)$ is A -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow A)$, and the proof is completed. $\square$

Remark 4.12. For any non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$, denote

$$\overline{\mathfrak{D}}_b(X, Y) = \{\text{all maps } P : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X) \rightarrow Y\} = \mathfrak{M}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_b(X) \rightarrow Y).$$

Then one can similarly define and study non-Archimedean metrics $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^\lambda$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,Y}^{*\lambda}$ for $\overline{\mathfrak{D}}_b(X, Y)$.

5. Ultrametric structures on non-Archimedean measures

Let K be a complete non-Archimedean valued field with absolute value $|\cdot|$, and X be a subset of K . Then with the metric induced by the absolute value $|\cdot|$, K become a non-Archimedean metric space and X is one of its subspace. It is well known that every non-empty open subset in a non-Archimedean metric space is a disjoint union of balls of the forms $\overline{B}_a(r)$ (see [Sc], p.48). In this section, we assume that every ball in X is compact and contains at least two distinct points. Then it follows that an open subset of X is compact if and only if it is a finite disjoint union of balls. Recall that a K -valued distribution on X is a finitely additive function

$$\mu : \Omega(X) = \{\text{all compact open subsets } U \text{ of } X\} \longrightarrow K.$$

μ is called a K -valued measure if $\|\mu\| = \sup\{|\mu(U)| : U \in \Omega(X)\} < \infty$ (see [K], [Sc]). Such a measure can be integrated against any continuous K -valued function f on any compact subset U of X by evaluating the limit of Riemann sums

$$\int_U f(x) d\mu(x) = \lim_{\{x_j \in U_j\}} \sum_j f(x_j) \mu(U_j),$$

taken over increasingly fine covers of U by mutually disjoint compact open subsets U_j (see [DD, p.308] and [K, p.39]). By definition, a K -valued distribution μ is completely determined by its values on the balls, i.e., on the elements of $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$. In particular, μ can be considered as a K -valued function on $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$, that is, the restriction $\mu|_{\mathcal{M}_b(X)} \in \mathfrak{D}_b(X, K)$. We denote

$$\text{DIS}(X \rightarrow K) = \{\text{all } K\text{-valued distributions on } X\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K) = \{\text{all } K\text{-valued measures on } X\}.$$

By the definition of K -valued distribution and Theorem 4.2.(1) above, it is easy to see that all $\widehat{\beta}_{X,K}^\lambda$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{X,K}^{*\lambda}$ are non-Archimedean metrics on $\text{DIS}(X \rightarrow K)$, in particular, $(\text{DIS}(X \rightarrow K), \widehat{\beta}_{X,K})$ is a non-Archimedean metric space, and $(\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K), \widehat{\beta}_{X,K})$ is one of its subspace. Here

$$\widehat{\beta}_{X,K}^\lambda(\mu', \mu'') = \widehat{\beta}_{X,K}^\lambda(\mu'|_{\mathcal{M}_b(X)}, \mu''|_{\mathcal{M}_b(X)}) \text{ and } \widehat{\beta}_{X,K}^{*\lambda}(\mu', \mu'') = \widehat{\beta}_{X,K}^{*\lambda}(\mu'|_{\mathcal{M}_b(X)}, \mu''|_{\mathcal{M}_b(X)}) \\ (\forall \mu', \mu'' \in \text{DIS}(X \rightarrow K)).$$

For a sequence of K -valued measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and μ in $\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$, it is called that μ_n converges to μ , written $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$, if for every $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, $\int_X f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., $|\int_X f d\mu_n - \int_X f d\mu| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. One can easily see that the following statements hold (see [K] and [Wa]):

- (1) If μ_n ($n = 1, \dots, \infty$) and μ are K -valued measures such that for every subsequence $\mu_{n(k)}$ ($k = 1, \dots, \infty$) there is a subsequence $\mu_{n(k(r))} \rightarrow \mu$, then $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$.
- (2) For $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$, if $\int_X f d\mu_1 = \int_X f d\mu_2$ for all $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, then $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

It follows that a convergent sequence of K -valued measures has a unique limit.

We say that the K -valued measures μ_n uniformly converge to $\mu \in \text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$, written $\mu_n \rightrightarrows \mu$, if $\int_X f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$ uniformly for all $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We say that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in total variation if $\sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} |\mu_n(B) - \mu(B)| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 5.1. Let X be a compact subset of K . For $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$ and $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, we denote $\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = \int_X f d\mu_1 - \int_X f d\mu_2$, and define the K -valued Dudley metric (we will show that it is indeed a metric) as follows:

$$\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup\{|\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)| : f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K) \text{ and } \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq 1\}.$$

(See Definition 4.10 above for $\|f\|_{\widehat{BL}}$).

Theorem 5.2. $\widehat{D}_{X,K}$ is a non-Archimedean metric on $\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$.

Proof. Obviously, $\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu, \mu) = 0$ and $\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_2, \mu_1) \geq 0$ for all $\mu, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$. Now let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$, since

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)| &= |\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_3) + \int_X f d(\mu_3 - \mu_2)| \\ &\leq \max\{|\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_3)|, |\int_X f d(\mu_3 - \mu_2)|\} \quad (\forall f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K) \text{ with } \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq 1), \end{aligned}$$

we have $\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_1, \mu_2) \leq$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup\{\max\{|\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_3)|, |\int_X f d(\mu_3 - \mu_2)|\} : f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K) \text{ with } \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq 1\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_1, \mu_3), \widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_3, \mu_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the strong triangle inequality holds.

Lastly, we assume that $\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = 0$, and we need to show that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. To see this, by the assumption, we have $|\int_X f d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)| = 0$, and hence

$$\int_X f d\mu_1 = \int_X f d\mu_2 \text{ for all } f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K) \text{ with } \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq 1. \quad (\star)$$

Take $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, and let χ_B be the characteristic function, i.e.,

$\chi_B(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in B, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$ Then χ_B is a locally constant function, hence a continuous function on X (see [K], p.31), i.e., $\chi_B \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$. Moreover, it follows easily by definition that $\|\chi_B\|_\infty = 1$ and $\text{dil}(\chi_B) \leq 1/\text{diam}B$. If $\text{diam}B \geq 1$, then $\text{dil}(\chi_B) \leq 1$, so $\|\chi_B\|_{\widehat{BL}} = \|\chi_B\|_\infty = 1$, hence by the above $(\star)$, we get $\mu_1(B) = \int_X \chi_B d\mu_1 = \int_X \chi_B d\mu_2 = \mu_2(B)$.

If $\text{diam}B < 1$, then we take $a, b \in B$ with $a \neq b$, and let $c = a - b$, then $c \in K$ and $0 < |c| \leq \text{diam}B < 1$. Let $f = c \cdot \chi_B$, then $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, $\|f\|_\infty = |c| \cdot \|\chi_B\|_\infty = |c|$, and $\text{dil}(f) = |c| \cdot \text{dil}(\chi_B) \leq |c|/\text{diam}B \leq 1$, which implies $\|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq 1$. Then by the above $(\star)$, we have $\int_X f d\mu_1 = \int_X f d\mu_2$, i.e., $\int_X c \cdot \chi_B d\mu_1 = \int_X c \cdot \chi_B d\mu_2$, so $\int_X \chi_B d\mu_1 = \int_X \chi_B d\mu_2$, i.e., $\mu_1(B) = \mu_2(B)$. To sum up, we have shown that $\mu_1(B) = \mu_2(B)$ for every $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$, which implies $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. Therefore, $\widehat{D}_{X,K}$ is a non-Archimedean metric on $\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$. The proof is completed. $\square$

For X and K in Definition 5.1, recall that

$$\widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow K) = \{f \in \mathfrak{M}(X \rightarrow K) : \|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty\}.$$

Theorem 5.3. Let X be a compact subset of K . For μ and a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$, if there exists a $c > 0$ such that $\|\mu_n\| \leq c$ for all positive integers n , then the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$.
- (2) $\int_X f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$ for all $f \in \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow K)$.

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2). Let $f \in \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow K)$, then $\|f\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty$, in particular, $\text{dil}(f) < \infty$. So f is uniformly continuous, and $f \in \mathfrak{C}_u(X \rightarrow K) \subset \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, hence $\int_X f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$.

(2) $\implies$ (1). Let $\text{Step}(X) = \{K\text{-valued locally constant functions on } X\}$, then $\text{Step}(X)$ is dense in the K -Banach space $\mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$ with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ defined above (see [Wa], p.237). We assert that $\text{Step}(X) \subset \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow K)$. In fact, since X is compact, for every $g \in \text{Step}(X)$, g is a finite linear combination of characteristic functions of disjoint balls, i.e., $g = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} a_i \chi_i$, where $a_i \in K$, χ_i is the characteristic function of the ball B_i and $X = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq r} B_i$ (the disjoint union). Obviously, $\|g\|_\infty = \max\{|a_i| : i = 1, \dots, r\} < \infty$. Fix a point $x_i \in B_i$ for each i , then $\text{dist}(B_i, B_j) = |x_i - x_j|$ for each pair (i, j) (see [Sc], p.48). Denote $\gamma = \min\{|x_i - x_j| : 1 \leq i, j \leq r \text{ and } i \neq j\}$ and $\alpha = \max\{|a_i - a_j| : 1 \leq i, j \leq r\}$, then $\gamma > 0, 0 \leq \alpha < \infty$, and it is easy to verify that $\text{dil}(g) \leq \alpha/\gamma < \infty$, hence $\|g\|_{\widehat{BL}} < \infty$. Therefore $\text{Step}(X) \subset \widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow K)$.

Now for every $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, since $\text{Step}(X)$ is dense in $\mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, there exists a Cauchy sequence $\{f_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ in $\text{Step}(X)$ such that $f_m \rightarrow f$. Then by the proof of Proposition 12.1 in [Wa], we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_m d\mu = \int_X f d\mu \text{ and } \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_m d\mu_n = \int_X f d\mu_n \text{ } (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Moreover, for every such f_m , as shown in the above assertion, it is also in $\widehat{BL}(X \rightarrow K)$, so by the assumption, we have $\int_X f_m d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f_m d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote $c_0 = \max\{\|\mu\|, c\}$. Then by the hypothesis, $\|\mu_n\| \leq c_0$ for all positive integers n . Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$, since $f_m \rightarrow f$ under the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, there exists a $M > 0$ such that for all integers $m > M$ we have $\|f_m - f\|_\infty < \varepsilon/c_0$, in particular, $|f_m(x) - f(x)| < \varepsilon/c_0$ for all $x \in X$. So $|\int_X f_m d\mu_n - \int_X f d\mu_n| < \varepsilon/c_0 \cdot c_0 = \varepsilon$ for all positive integers n and all integers $m > M$ (see [K], p.40). Also $|\int_X f_m d\mu - \int_X f d\mu| < \varepsilon$ for all integers $m > M$. We fix an integer $m_0 > M$, then

from $\int_X f_{m_0} d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f_{m_0} d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a $N > 0$ such that for all integers $n > N$, we have $|\int_X f_{m_0} d\mu_n - \int_X f_{m_0} d\mu| < \varepsilon$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\int_X f d\mu_n - \int_X f d\mu| \leq \\ & \max\{|\int_X f d\mu_n - \int_X f_{m_0} d\mu_n|, |\int_X f_{m_0} d\mu_n - \int_X f_{m_0} d\mu|, |\int_X f_{m_0} d\mu - \int_X f d\mu|\} \\ & < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So $\int_X f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, hence $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$. The proof is completed. $\square$

Theorem 5.4. Let X be a compact subset of K . For μ and a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\text{MEA}(X \rightarrow K)$, if there exists a $c > 0$ such that $\|\mu_n\| \leq c$ for all positive integers n , then we have

- (1) $\widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0 \implies \mu_n \rightarrow \mu$.
- (2) $\widehat{\beta}_{X,K}(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0 \implies \mu_n \rightarrow \mu$.

Proof. (1) Let $B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$ and χ_B be the corresponding characteristic function. Take $a = b - c$ for some $b, c \in B$ with $b \neq c$, then $a \in K$ and $|a| \leq \text{diam}(B)$. We set $\chi = \begin{cases} \chi_B & \text{if } \text{diam}(B) \geq 1, \\ a \cdot \chi_B & \text{if } \text{diam}(B) < 1. \end{cases}$ Then from the proof of the above Theorem 5.2, we know that $\|\chi\|_{\widehat{BL}} \leq 1$, and then $|\int_X \chi d\mu_n - \int_X \chi d\mu| \leq \widehat{D}_{X,K}(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$, so $\int_X \chi d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X \chi d\mu$, and so $\int_X \chi_B d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X \chi_B d\mu$. It then follows that $\int_X g d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X g d\mu$ for all $g \in \text{Step}(X)$.

Now let $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, then as discussed in the proof of the above Theorem 5.3, there exists a Cauchy sequence $\{f_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ in $\text{Step}(X)$, such that $f_m \rightarrow f$. By the above discussion, we have $\int_X f_m d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f_m d\mu$ ($m = 1, 2, \dots$). Denote $c_0 = \max\{\|\mu\|, c\}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, since $f_m \rightarrow f$, as discussed in the proof of the above Theorem 5.3, there exists a positive number M such that for all integers $m > M$, we have

$|\int_X f_m d\mu_n - \int_X f d\mu_n| < \varepsilon$ for all integers $n > 0$, and $|\int_X f_m d\mu - \int_X f d\mu| < \varepsilon$. Fix an integer $m_0 > M$, then since $\int_X f_{m_0} d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f_{m_0} d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a $N > 0$ such that for all $n > N$, we have $|\int_X f_{m_0} d\mu_n - \int_X f_{m_0} d\mu| < \varepsilon$, then as done in the proof of the above Theorem 5.3, we have $|\int_X f d\mu_n - \int_X f d\mu| < \varepsilon$. Hence $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$. This proves (1).

(2) If $\widehat{\beta}_{X,K}(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$, then by Theorem 4.2.(2) above, we have $\widehat{\rho}_s(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $\sup_{B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)} |\mu_n(B) - \mu(B)| \rightarrow 0$, and then $|\int_X \chi_B d\mu_n - \int_X \chi_B d\mu| = |\mu_n(B) - \mu(B)| \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $\int_X \chi_B d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X \chi_B d\mu$, where χ_B is the characteristic function of B ($\forall B \in \mathcal{M}_b(X)$). It follows then $\int_X g d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X g d\mu$ for all $g \in \text{Step}(X)$, and as done in the proof of the above (1), one can similarly show that, for every $f \in \mathfrak{C}(X \rightarrow K)$, $\int_X f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X f d\mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$. This proves (2), and the proof of Theorem 5.4 is completed. $\square$

References

- [BBI] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, A Course in Metric Geometry, Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [BGR] S. Bosch, U. Guntzer, R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean Analysis, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [D] R. M. Dudley, Real Analysis and Probability, Second Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [DD] H. Darmon, S. Dasgupta, Elliptic units for real quadratic fields, Ann. of Math., 163 (2006), 301-346.

- [FP] J. Frensel, M. Van der Put, Rigid Analytic Geometry and Its Applications, Progress in Math., Vol. 218, Boston: Birkhauser, 2004.
- [G] M. Gromov, Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces, Boston: Birkhauser, 2001.
- [K] N. Koblitz, p -adic Numbers, p -adic Analysis, and Zeta Functions, Second Edition, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [L] S. Lang, Algebraic Number Theory, Second Edition, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [Q] D. R. Qiu, Geometry of non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance, p -adic numbers, ultrametric analysis and applications, 4 (2009), 317-337.
- [Ra] S. Rachev, Hausdorff metric structure of the space of probability measures, Translated from Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov Leningradskogo Otdeleniya Matematicheskogo Instituta im. V. A. Steklova AN SSSR, 87 (1979), 87-103.
- [Sc] W. H. Schikhof, Ultrametric Calculus, London: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [Se] J.-P. Serre, Local Fields, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [Wa] L.C. Washington, Introduction to Cyclotomic Fields, 2nd Edition, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1997.